

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

June 3, 2015

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT 7014 0150 0000 1194 2944

David McMullin CS Mining, LLC PO Box 608 Milford, UT 84751

Subject: Proposed Assessment for State Notice of Violation No. MN-2015-62-01, CS Mining,

LLC., Hidden Treasure Mine, M/001/0067, Beaver County, Utah

Response Due By: 30 Days of Receipt

Dear Mr. McMullin:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the assessment officer for assessing penalties under R647-7.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced notice of violation. The NOV was issued by Division inspector, Peter Brinton, on April 20, 2015. Rule R647-7-103 et. seq. has been utilized to determine the proposed penalty of \$770.00. The enclosed worksheet outlines how the civil penalty was assessed.

By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this NOV has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of this penalty.

Under R647-7-106, there are two informal appeal options available to you. You may appeal the 'fact of the violation', the proposed civil penalty, or both. If you wish to informally appeal you should file a written request for an informal conference within thirty 30 days of receipt of this letter.



Page 2 of 5 David McMullin M/001/0067 June 3, 2015

The informal conference will be conducted by a Division-appointed conference officer. The informal conference for the fact of the violation is distinct from the informal assessment conference regarding the proposed penalty. If you wish to review both the fact of the violation and proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an assessment conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. In this case, the assessment conference will be scheduled immediately following the review of the fact of the violation.

If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of the violation will stand, the proposed penalty will become final, and will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the date of this proposed assessment (by July 2, 2015). Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Sheri Sasaki.

Sincerely,

Lynn Kunzler

Assessment Officer

LK: eb

Enclosure: Proposed assessment worksheet cc: Sheri Sasaki, Accounting Vickie Southwick, Exec. Sec.

P:\GROUPS\MINERALS\WP\M001-Beaver\M0010067-HiddenTreasure\non-compliance\MN-2015-62-01\pass-6587-06012015

06012015.doc

Page 3 of 5 David McMullin M/001/0067 June 3, 2015

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING Minerals Regulatory Program

NOV	/CO	#: MN-2	2015-62-01	T: M/001/0067					
COM	IPANY	/ MINE	CS Mining / Hide	den Treasure Mine					
ASSI	ESSMI	ENT DA	TE June 1, 2015						
			FICER Lynn Kunz	der					
11001	2001111	3111 011	Telic	are i					
I.	HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.) (R647–7-103.2.11) A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall three (3) years of today's date?								
	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS			EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS (1pt for NOV 5pts for CO)				
		N	lone	N/A	0				
				TOTAL	HISTORY POINTS 0				
II.	SERIOUSNESS (Max 45pts) (R647–7-103.2.12)								
		NOTE:		nts in Parts II and III, the following					
				supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within where the violation falls.					
		2.	Beginning at the mid-point of the category, the Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector=s and operator=s statements as guiding documents.						
		Is this	an EVENT (A) or A	Administrative (B) violation	? EVENT (A)				
			(assign points according						
	A.	EVEN	IT VIOLATIONS (A6 - 45 - 4 \					
	A.	1.	What is the event		was designed to prevent?				
		1.	What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent? Operating without appropriate approvals, Environmental Harm, Loss of						
			reclamation potent	* * * *	vironmemai Harm, Loss oj				
		2.	What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated						
		2.	standard was desig		e event winon a violated				
			PROBABII		RANGE				
			None	0	ICH TOE				
			Unlikely	1-9					
			Likely	10-19					
			Occurred	20					

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 15

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS: <u>Inspector indicated that the event(s)</u> were likely to occur. The operator did not provide any information regarding this violation. Therefore points were assigned at the mid-point of the 'likely' range.

Page 4 of 5 David McMullin M/001/0067 June 3, 2015

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage: <u>Most damage would not extend off the permitted area.</u> However, topsoil salvage at the toe of the <u>dumps may extend beyond the current permit limits, thus the permit would need to be amended.</u>

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS (RANGE 0-25) 7

In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS: <u>Since most damage would occur</u> within the permitted area, points were assigned at mid-point of the lower ½ of the range.

B. <u>ADMINISTRATIVE VIOLATIONS</u> (Max 25pts)

1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement? ______ Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS N/A

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS: _

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 22

III. <u>DEGREE OF FAULT</u> (Max 30 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.13)

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE

A. IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, , IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE. Point Range No Negligence (Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care?)

Negligence (was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care?)

Greater Degree of Fault (was this a failure to abate any violation or was economic gain realized by the permittee?

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 10

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS: <u>Points assigned at 2/3 of negligent range</u>

— <u>Operator should be aware of permit requirements, and potential for financial gain did</u>

<u>exist since regrading dumps to the 3h:1v slope was not in the approved bond calculation.</u>

Page 5 of 5 David McMullin M/001/0067 June 3, 2015

IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.) (R467-7-103.2.14)

(Either A or B) (Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures, or violations not abated at the time of assessment)

Has Violation Been Abated? Yes / No

A. EASY ABATEMENT (The operator had onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area.)

	Point Range
Immediate Compliance	-11 to -20
(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)	
Rapid Compliance	-1 to -10
(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation.	
Violation abated in less time than allotted.)	
Normal Compliance	0
(Operator complied within the abatement period required,	
or, Operator requested an extension to abatement time)	

B. DIFFICULT ABATEMENT (The operator did not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or the submission of plans was required prior to physical activity to achieve compliance.)

	Point Range -11 to -20
Rapid Compliance	-11 to -20
(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation.	
Violation abated in less time than allotted.)	
Normal Compliance	-1 to -10
(Operator complied within the abatement period)	
Extended Compliance	0
(Operator complied within the abatement period required,	
or, Operator requested an extension to abatement time)	
(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay	
within the limits of the violation, or the plan submitted	
for abatement was incomplete.)	

<u>EASY</u> OR <u>DIFFICULT</u> ABATEMENT? <u>Since plans were required, this is considered a difficult abatement situation.</u>

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS: While operator provided the increase surety before the abatement deadline, the revised plans were hand delivered on the abatement deadline. Therefore good faith points were awarded at the midpoint of the 'normal' compliance range.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY (R647-7-103.3)

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	0
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	22
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	10
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	-5
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	27
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	\$ 770.00